

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,044		08/20/2003	Hideo Miyazaki	0649-0908P	5084
2292	7590	05/04/2006		EXAMINER	
BIRCH ST PO BOX 74		T KOLASCH &	PHASGE, ARUN S		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	ĺ			1753	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
				DATE MAILED: 05/04/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	055 4.45 0	10/644,044	MIYAZAKI ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Arun S. Phasge	1753	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	••
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAISIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timulated and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communic D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)⊠ 3)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		s is
	on of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 1-3,5 and 7-21 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-3,5 and 7-21 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers	vn from consideration.		
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 2.	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
2) 🔲 Notica	e of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite	
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)	

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Schlager or the Japanese Patent Tatsuaki.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/6/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the *prima facie* case for obviousness has not been made by the combination, and that *arguendo* the present method produces unexpected results typified by Examples 2-4 in the specification.

The Suzuki patent teaches the use of mixing during electrolysis to obtain efficient treatment to complete the electrolysis (see col. 11, lines 22-32). The patent teaches the use of a revolving plate or rod or other conventional techniques so that "the electrolytic solution on the electrode surface can be moved to a satisfactory extent." (lines 26-27 of col. 11). To optimize the process disclosed by the Suzuki patent to obtain a workable range through routine experimentation

would have been within the purview of the ordinary artisan. Discovery of optimum value of result effective variable in known process is ordinarily within skill of art. *In re Boesch and Slaney* 205 USPQ 215. (CCPA 1980).

The secondary references were cited to show the use of vibrating plates to provide mixing. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the disclosure of the Suzuki patent with the teachings of the secondary reference, because the secondary references teach the use of vibrating plates to mix the electrolyte during electrodes.

It is unclear what examples 2-4 are supposed to show, since the Suzuki patent teaches the use of microorganisms following the electrolysis.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened

Art Unit: 1753

statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arun S. Phasge whose telephone number is (571) 272-1345. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-THURSDAY, 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam X. Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1753

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Arun S. Phasge

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1753